Where were you while we were getting high policing? The consequences of co-location for broader partnership working in tackling organised crime and terrorism

Atkinson, Colin

Published in:
Policing & Society

DOI:
10.1080/10439463.2018.1465058

Published: 13/10/2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Where were you while we were getting high policing? The consequences of co-location for broader partnership working in tackling organised crime and terrorism

Colin Atkinson

Abstract
The Scottish Crime Campus (SCC) represents a significant financial and political investment in policing organised crime and terrorism in Scotland. The ethos of physically co-locating high-policing agencies and promoting partnership working has been central to the SCC; however, the consequences for those agencies and actors not permanently based here have hitherto been overlooked. Based on mixed methods research this study considers the range of 'outside' partners who work with the core SCC-based agencies, and explores the consequences of these co-location arrangements for broader partnership working across this 'new network' of high policing. It finds that these 'outside' partners report a range of positive benefits from engaging with the SCC: from improvements in the quality and depth of partnership working to enhanced service delivery in their own work. The SCC has deepened collaboration between the crime campus-based agencies and those partners who directly participate, albeit in a more limited fashion, in these co-location arrangements. Partnership working with agencies fully 'beyond' the crime campus, however, is better characterised as co-operative, not collaborative. Extending collaboration further across this network would bring further benefits, but requires the addressing of boundary issues, including challenges of insularity and isolation, that can result from co-location.

Introduction
The Scottish Crime Campus (SCC), located in the heart of Scotland's central belt in the town of Gartcosh, represents a significant financial and political investment by the Scottish Government in the policing of organised crime and terrorism. The SCC provides purpose-built specialist accommodation for policing, law enforcement, and criminal justice agencies in an effort to facilitate closer partnership working to tackle these issues. The SCC was officially opened in 2014, but the initial concept emerged a decade earlier. In October 2004 the then Director of the Scottish Drugs Enforcement Agency remarked on the promise of co-locating agencies at a single site in order to make combating organised crime more effective. Sketching this idea further he proposed,

We'll bring together all the experts from the different departments and organisations onto one site. They have similar targets, they gather together the intelligence they have on these targets and we're able more effectively to answer the threat that serious and organised crime presents in Scotland. Additionally, in a national and international context, a campus says to Europe that serious crime is not welcome here. (BBC News, 2004).

Building upon these comments, the Scottish Executive's December 2004 criminal justice plan, Supporting Safer, Stronger Communities, stated,
We will further strengthen the way Scotland deals with the threat of serious and organised crime, through a major project to bring together some of the key law enforcement agencies … in a new law enforcement campus. The creation of this proposed centre of excellence, which will take some years to bring to fruition, will send out a strong message to international criminal networks that Scotland is not a soft target and will respond quickly and robustly to protect our streets and communities from the threat posed by serious and organised crime. (2004, p. 22)

Whilst the path from ambitious idea to concrete reality was somewhat protracted, and incorporated counter-terrorism along the way, the ethos of bringing agencies together and promoting partnership working between them remained constant throughout.

Five agencies form the key operational partners based at the SCC. These include Scotland's new national police service, Police Scotland, and the nation's public prosecution service, the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS). Additionally, the SCC houses the primary Scottish footprint of two agencies with a United Kingdom (UK) wide remit: the National Crime Agency (NCA) and HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC). This site also provides a cutting-edge forensic science laboratory, allowing experts from the Scottish Police Authority Forensic Services to examine evidence in a state-of-the art facility. In considering the 'unambiguous promise' of the SCC in post-implementation practice Cavanagh et al remarked,

The crime campus approach, symbolising a fresh acceptance of the values and benefits of multi-agency partnership working, promises to overcome many of the traditional organisational and cultural barriers that have, historically, hindered organised crime policing. (2015, p. 127)

Crucially, the SCC also hosts a more limited presence from a further 15 agencies, as well as the requirement to work with a broader range of agencies, organisations, and actors with no footprint at all at the crime campus. The benefits of the SCC for those five key agencies with a substantial presence at the crime campus have been generally recognised (see Scottish Police Authority, 2014). However, the consequences of the crime campus and its co-location arrangements for these other agencies, organisations, and actors – for broader partnership working – has not been explored. This reflects a wider malaise in studies of partnership working more generally, within which the externalities of such approaches have not been a concern.

Research aims and methods

This article addresses current gaps in the evidence base by assessing: the engagement of the five key co-located agencies with 'outside' partners; the extent and quality of any such partnership working arrangements; and the impact of co-location for those partners 'beyond' the crime campus.[1] It draws upon a mixed methods approach – comprised of two overlapping data collection tools and an integrated analysis of this data – to deliver upon its research objectives. Firstly, an online survey was disseminated to 31 agencies, organisations, and actors providing a current or potential contribution to the SCC, with the aim of gathering baseline statistical data on partnership working arrangements.[2] Survey recipients included public agencies, third sector organisations, community and religious groups, private industry, and professional associations. This survey particularly focussed upon awareness, understanding, and perceptions of the crime campus. It was completed by practitioner representatives from recipient organisations and agencies and, indicative of the internal cascading of this request, a small number of multiple responses from recipient agencies or organisations was recorded, bringing the final number of submitted responses was 38. Secondly, a series of 12 semi-structured interviews was undertaken with representatives from organisations and agencies who work in partnership with the five core SCC agencies. The aim of these interviews was to provide further insights into the benefits and challenges of the crime campus concept, gather detail of the nature of partnership working in practice, and explore the consequences of co-location, if any, for the delivery of their own work and the wider policing and justice landscape. Interviewees were approached in accordance with a purposive sampling procedure, with the aim of achieving a diverse yet representative range of participants. Given that both the survey and interviews engaged only a sample of partner agencies there is the clear possibility that the responses may not be generalisable.

[1] This approach reflects the same principles for assessing the effectiveness of partnership working as developed by Diamond (2006).

[2] Reflecting the understandably opaque nature of much of the policing of terrorism and organised crime, and the 'outsider' status of the researcher, this list of agencies and actors was initially compiled by the SCC and forwarded to the researcher for subsequent dissemination of the survey instrument as deemed necessary. The researcher exercised control over the use, non-use, or supplementation of this list in this regard.

Therefore the data presented in this study – particularly in regard to interviews, where a smaller number of participants was engaged – should be considered appropriately.

Despite the limitations of the methodology the overall approach delivered wide-ranging responses from an array of participants, including critical insights into the effectiveness of the crime campus and on working in partnership with SCC-based agencies. Following Leech and Onwuegbuzie (2009, p. 267–268) the mixed methods analysis was a partially mixed sequential equal status design. Reflecting the partial level of mixing, the integrated analysis of quantitative and qualitative data was completed using both SPSS and NVivo software packages. This study presents its findings across two inter-linked themes: 'co-location and communication' and 'from co-location to broader collaboration?'. A final section considers some of the challenges raised by the research participants, in particular the requirement to avoid the potential isolation that can occur when implementing new co-location arrangements. Before doing so, however, this study is contextualised by considering the existing research on partnership working, co-location, and boundaries in policing and law enforcement, particularly in the context of 'high policing'.

Partnership working, co-location, and boundaries in high policing

The concept of 'high policing' was first introduced in 1983 by the Canadian criminologist Jean-Paul Brodeur, who subsequently reconsidered and reappraised the concept in the post-9/11 period (1983, 2007). Central to Brodeur's analytical approach is the distinction between 'high policing' and 'low policing'. For Brodeur high policing is characterised by four key features: the wide scope and strategic use of intelligence; the conflation of separate state powers; the protection of national security; and the use of human sources and undercover operatives (2007, p. 27–28). Low policing, comparatively neglected as a distinct conceptual approach, refers to policing in the tradition of Sir Robert Peel: the consensual maintenance of order and suppression of crime, particularly street-based crime, using preventive patrol by uniformed officers who are visible to the community. The terrorist attacks of 9/11 and subsequent developments in the threat landscape have channelled the high policing lens towards understanding the various forms of counter-terrorism that have proliferated in the period since (see Palmer and Whelan, 2006; Bayley and Weisburd, 2011). Moreover, the concept has also been successfully applied in considering the contemporary challenges of policing organised crime (see Harfield, 2008, Tilley, 2016), which adopts similar tactics and methods to its counter-terrorism counterpart. The concept of high policing has gained significant traction in police studies, prompting both critical reconceptualisation (O'Reilly and Ellison, 2006) and the framing of empirical study (see Lowe, 2011); both of which are indicative of the success of Brodeur's lens in shifting the analytical gaze towards a previous 'backwater' in police research (Sheptycki, 2007a, p. 70). Yet despite such contributions previous accounts have not explored the inter-linked phenomena of partnership working and co-location in the 'house' of high policing.[3]

Partnership working is not a particularly new phenomenon (see Balloch and Taylor, 2001) and has become embedded in both the discourses and practices of contemporary policing agencies across the world (see, for example, Bull, 2010). As Megan O'Neill (2014, p. 203) highlights, the police service does not operate in a vacuum, but in the course of fulfilling its duties instead 'collaborates' with local government and a range of agencies in the public, private, and voluntary sectors. It is important to recognise that the existing UK and international police literature mostly considers partnership working in the local contexts of low policing (see, as examples, Hipple, 2017, Sarre and Prenzler, 2018). Where partnership working is considered in high policing this is generally in relation to counter-terrorism (see Manningham-Buller, 2007, Briggs, 2010, Thomas, 2016). Partnership working in the high policing of organised crime remains less well-traversed in comparison; although notable insights in this area include the work of Kirby and Snow (2016), which highlighted the importance of such approaches to disrupting organised crime in operational contexts. Recognising the significance of partnership

[3] Adapting here the terminology previously used by Sheptycki (2007b).

working to the high policing of both terrorism and organised crime is important in the context of the research herein, given that the SCC focuses its activities on both of these issues. Moreover, the crime campus reflects how partnership working has become increasingly important in Scotland both within and beyond criminal justice; with partnership working increasingly underpinned by legislation as a primary tool to deliver complex public services and governance practices (see Carley, 2006; Fenwick et al. 2012). The co-location arrangements at the SCC, however, represent a step-change in the promotion of partnership working and a re-imagination of organisational boundaries in high policing.

Co-location – literally, and at its most basic, the housing of multiple agencies under one shared roof, where such agencies maintain their individual identities – is not essential to partnership working, but it has been argued to be important in establishing more effective partnership working, greater than the sum of its parts (Crawford and Cunningham, 2015, p. 87). Co-location arrangements seek to encourage communication, information sharing, and to capitalise on economies of scale. Co-location philosophies, projects, and practices are not unique to policing or law enforcement agencies, and are apparent in other areas of the public sector and private industry (see Sennett, 2001; Hudson, 2002, McKelvey et al. 2003, Song et al. 2007, Lockett et al. 2009, Felzensztein et al. 2010, Cheng et al. 2014). A small number of studies has explored co-location in low policing contexts (see Lewis, 2013, O'Neill, 2014), and an even more limited range of evidence considers some of the consequences of co-location in high policing (Fyfe, 2015a, Elliot and Tatnell, 2016). The relative paucity of studies of partnership working and co-location in high policing does not reflect the importance ascribed to such approaches by practitioners and policymakers in this area. Capitalising upon the underlying philosophy of partnership working – that complex problems require agencies to work together closely, 'co-operatively' and 'collaboratively' to devise solutions and implement effective responses (Douglas, p. 2) – practices of co-location have become increasingly prevalent and prominent in high policing. In fact, co-location practices are evident across and between agencies responsible for both counter-terrorism and tackling organised crime.[4] As an illustrative example, the National Crime Agency (2015) reports the benefits of maintaining open and transparent working relationships with partners who can deliver operational activity to disrupt serious and organised crime. However, despite these emerging practices, awareness and understanding of co-location in high policing is limited. In particular, the existing literature does not consider the impact of co-location practices on the nature of partnership working with those 'outside' agencies, organisations, and actors who do not fully participate in co-location arrangements.

This research addresses such gaps in the literature by assessing the impact of the SCC upon engagement between co-located agencies and 'outside' partners, the extent and quality of partnership working arrangements, and the impact of the crime campus on the activities of those partners beyond the crime campus. Nick Fyfe (2018) has noted how the introduction of the SCC is part of a 'new ecology' of policing in Scotland; one that has not only resulted in the emergence of powerful new actors, but has also created new organisational boundaries to navigate. Whilst Fyfe is rightly concerned with the implications of these developments within Police Scotland, and the impact of these new politics on traditional community policing approaches, there are also implications for partnership working beyond the police service itself. For the purposes of this research the relationship between the agencies co-located at the SCC and those outside partners was understood in a tri-partite

[4] The Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre (JTAC), based at the Security Service headquarters at Thames House in London, is an illustrative example in this area (see Gill and Phythian, 2006, p. 51–52). Additionally, the processes of the 'regionalisation' of the Security Service presence across the UK has highlighted the value of proximal co-location of agencies engaged in counter-terrorism work (see Manningham-Buller 2007, p. 44–45; Gregory 2007, p. 186–187; Northcott 2007, p. 470–471; Intelligence and Security Committee, p. 12–13). Considering co-location between agencies primarily responsible for national security and those who respond to organised crime, the Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) and the NCA operate a co-located Joint Operations Cell, which focuses on tackling online child sexual exploitation (GCHQ, 2015).

fashion; situating agencies, organisations, and actors across three distinct spaces, with concomitant boundaries. These spaces were defined as,

- Core: five SCC-based 'key' agencies with a permanent and substantial presence at the crime campus

- Liminal: 15 agencies and organisations with a partial footprint at the crime campus; for example, through individual secondee(s) or access to a 'hot-desk' facility

- External: the broader range of agencies, organisations, and actors not based at the crime campus but with whom there is routine contact and/or a requirement for engagement in efforts to tackle organised crime and/or terrorism.

Beyond the five core SCC-based agencies, the 15 liminal partners include an array of government and local authority bodies with an interest or capability in tackling organised crime and/or terrorism. The range of agencies, organisations, and actors in the external space is diverse: from university and academic establishments to community and faith-based groups.

Fully understanding the nature of organisational boundaries in policing, and beyond, is essential to the analysis of the SCC and the engagement of co-located agencies with 'outside' partners. In Policing Integration: The Sociology of Police Coordination Work (2015) Chris Giacomantonio provides a typology of organisational boundaries in policing and an account of the role of power dynamics in creating, maintaining, challenging, and negotiating such boundaries. For Giacomantonio,

The typology has three categories: (1) scarcity boundaries, or the negotiation of resources; (2) proximity boundaries, or the negotiation of distance; (3) technological/systemic boundaries, or the negotiation of process (2015, p. 103).

Each of these are then further sub-categorised into the physical (boundaries that can be seen and touched) and the virtual (boundaries that are invisible, but the effects of which are observable and tangible); although the distinction here is often one of degree, rather than complete difference, given that both sub-categories interact (Giacomantonio, 2015, p. 103). Whilst Giacomantonio's typology was designed and implemented for analysis of boundaries within the police service it offers a promising basis for exploring the nature of partnership working across policing. Therefore, in exploring engagement with those organisations and agencies beyond the 'core' at the crime campus and conceptualising political interaction across this broader network, aspects of Giacomantonio's typology will be invoked at relevant points in the analysis. In doing so this study explores the consequences of co-locating agencies at the crime campus upon the nature, extent, and quality of partnership working across this network, as well as considering how the SCC has influenced the activities of outside agencies and actors themselves. The sections that follow present the substantive findings of this research.

Co-location and communication

Co-location practices to facilitate partnership working form an immediate remedy, at least in theory, to the challenges presented by proximity boundaries, and may prospectively address the scarcity and technological/systemic boundaries also present in Giacomantonio's typology. Yet simply housing multiple agencies under a shared roof, whilst a minimum requirement, may not automatically trigger the underlying mechanisms necessary to address such boundaries. One such mechanism that must be activated and embedded in co-location arrangements is communication. Academic research has, across a sustained period of time, reported upon the importance of communication between police services, law enforcement agencies, and others in partnership or multi-agency arrangements (see

Noaks, 2008, McCarthy and O'Neill, 2014). These academic insights have been supported by various inspections and enquiries that have highlighted the requirement to share information within and between agencies.[5] Such mechanisms are also important in high policing. For example, in considering a specific multi-agency disruption initiative taken against organised crime groups in England, Kirby and Nailer (2013, p. 407) reported that the increased flow of information between partners resulted in both increased awareness of common problems and an improved propensity for action to be taken across the network. Co-location practices are frequently justified as a means to achieve better partnership working through enhanced communication and information sharing, including in policing contexts (see Berry et al. 2011).

Communication underpins developing forms of partnership working between core SCC-based agencies and partners across this new network of high policing in Scotland. Drawing upon the data from this research study it was found that the impact of the crime campus on communication between the core SCC-based agencies and its various outside partners has been broadly positive. Most respondents in survey research (21) reported that they communicate more frequently with the core SCC-based agencies since the implementation of the crime campus, and with greater efficiency and effectiveness.[6] Crucially, 17 respondents reported that they now engage with agencies based at the SCC with whom they did not communicate previously. Participants in the qualitative interview stage of the study elaborated further upon how the provision of a dedicated facility for high policing that co-locates relevant agencies has facilitated improvements in communication. For one interviewee,

What it has done is when we go to the campus being [able] to meet with multiple people in one go, rather than having to meet with people over several days and going to different locations. It's a lot easier and also there's more 'catch ups'. We can now pop over to someone's desk if we are in there. To be honest I'd say [the benefits are] outwith Police Scotland. Police Scotland are only one of our main partners. The NCA, the Crown Office, HMRC, we have interactions with them [too]. And to have their senior people we deal with more available to us, it's great. (Interviewee E3)

Another interviewee also noted how the co-location concept and the provision of a dedicated facility were important factors in improving the frequency and quality of face-to-face communication, both with Police Scotland and the range of other agencies co-located at the crime campus. This insight is particularly important given that previous research, in non-policing/law enforcement settings, has highlighted how an increasing level of face-to-face contact has been recognised as a positive way to improve partnership working (Northmore, 2001, p. 106–107). As a further interviewee simply summarised,

It's great having the relevant people around the table. (Interviewee E6)

There was some isolated evidence of disruption in communication between partners and particular SCC-based agencies following the move to the crime campus; however, such challenges were not systematically reported and are likely to have been closely intertwined with wider, challenging processes of police reform that were ongoing alongside the implementation of the crime campus in Scotland (see Fyfe, 2015b Fyfe, N.R., 2015b).[7] As an interviewee remarked,

[5] Including those undertaken in Scotland (see HMICS, 2007).

[6] To provide some additional context nine respondents reported that they now communicate less frequently with the core SCC agencies.

[7] Police reform in Scotland involved the delivery of the provisions in the Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012, which amalgamated the eight territorial police forces in Scotland and specialist services of the Scottish Police Services Authority – including the Scottish Crime and Drug Enforcement Agency – into a single national police force. The 2012 Act also created the Scottish Police Authority, which was created to maintain policing in Scotland hold the new national force to account.

I am not sure that it's so easy to separate out from all the wider stuff. So it's quite hard to know which bits are the result of police reform and which bits are the result of the move [to the crime campus]. I am not even sure, I can't even think of what that timeline looked like. Now looking back on it, it just seems all 'in the past' and things you know are very different as to how they were, but I am just not really sure which bits of that are related to the physical, or the building, or even just things as simple as personality change [following police reform]. (Interviewee E4)

The crime campus has, therefore, had a positive effect on the nature and extent of communication between the SCC-based agencies and those partners beyond the crime campus. Such enhanced communication is an important underlying mechanism contributing to the vision of broader partnership working: reducing physical and virtual distance between relevant agencies, organisations, and actors, and ultimately underpinning deeper forms of collaboration between them. However, despite improvements in communication across this new network of high policing, such collaboration is neither inevitable nor assured under these arrangements.

From co-location to broader collaboration?

Co-location is a defining feature of the SCC, but only as a means to an end, not an end in itself. The SCC seeks to achieve an increased level of partnership working between the core agencies based at the crime campus and, importantly, between those agencies and the array of outside partners that can contribute to its high policing remit. The particular form of partnership working that is aspired towards is collaboration. As the second incumbent of the office of the chief constable of Police Scotland, Phil Gormley, remarked,

Moving into Gartcosh wasn't just about doing the same as we were all doing before in a new building; the aim was to build a new network for tackling crime and establish new ways of doing that. It has been about putting collaboration at the heart of what we do to make communities safer. (Police Scotland, 2016). Understanding the precise nature of 'collaboration' within this new network requires an unpacking of partnership working itself. Forms of partnership working can be characterised across a continuum: from no partnership, through co-operation, collaboration, and coordination, towards complete integration (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Partnership working continuum, adapted from Frost (2005)

No partnership	Agencies, organisations and actors operate independently of one another, in effective isolation
Co-operation	Agencies, organisations and actors work together in pursuit of short-term objectives, for the benefit of one or more partners
Collaboration	Agencies, organisations and actors work routinely and across a sustained period of time to create tangible product(s) that benefit all participants
Co-ordination	Agencies, organisations and actors organise, align and plan their resources in relation to one another, working towards shared strategic goals in a considered and systematic way
Integration/merger	Agencies, organisations and actors become a single unit to enhance service delivery

Considering partnership working across this spectrum – the forms of which are underpinned by appropriate mechanisms, such as levels of communication – goes some way to addressing fundamental concerns expressed by some about the utility of the concept of partnership working in practice (see Diamond, 2006). Importantly, each 'stage' of this continuum maintains its own unique set of boundaries between units. It cannot be assumed, for example, that integration/merger results in the eradication of boundaries; instead integration/merger creates new sets of internal

organisational and political boundaries that must be negotiated, as highlighted by Giacomantonio. This continuum thus provides a method for understanding and explaining the nature of partnership working between the SCC and other agencies, organisations, and actors in this 'new network' of high policing in Scotland.

One of the principal findings of this study was that liminal and external partners – those mostly or wholly based 'outside' of the SCC – believe that their engagement with the agencies based at the crime campus has improved following the co-location of those agencies. For example, the survey data provided that 23 respondents agreed with the statement that the extent of partnership working has improved since the creation of the crime campus, with 21 responding that the quality of partnership working had also improved.[8] Similar proportions of survey participants also responded that working in partnership with the now co-located agencies has helped them achieve better outcomes than under previous arrangements, and that the advent of the SCC has improved service delivery in their own organisation. Such positive perceptions of partnership working were also noted during qualitative interviews, where participants recounted the 'huge benefits' and 'positive effects' of co-location to the participating core agencies at the crime campus, to their own work, and to partnership working across this new high policing network. An illustrative example here, referenced by multiple interview participants, was the improvement in reciprocal information sharing between the core agencies and partners that has flowed from the implementation of the crime campus concept. Reflecting this point, another participant from a liminal agency with a partial footprint at the SCC talked extensively about how the ability to go to the crime campus and routinely engage with core agencies had enhanced enforcement endeavours in their own organisation; particularly in the new ability to access and exploit a deeper intelligence base to target activities and to obtain the support of resources from other agencies where required. He remarked,

We have got a seat [at the crime campus], we've got a desk in there. We are working in there, and I was able to personally come in and sit with the police officers and say 'What have you got? Well that's what we need', and jointly put a threat assessment together. Previously we would not have done that. (Interviewee L3)

Elaborating on a specific example of partnership working this interviewee noted how their efforts to deal with the illegal activities of an organised crime group 'was all done within two to three days' as a result of working with the co-located agencies, and where such co-ordination would previously have been difficult, if it was even possible at all.

The interview stage of the study also disclosed how forms of partnership working across this new network – in accordance with the continuum above – were not uniform. Working relationships between the core SCC agencies and external partners were characterised principally by co-operation, with agencies, organisations, and actors working together in pursuit of short-term objectives for the benefit of one or more partners. Examples given by faith-based groups, for example, included the provision of community advice to the core agencies in furtherance of operational or broader objectives; as well as the reciprocal dissemination of advice on counter-terrorism strategy from the core SCC-based agencies to communities in Scotland. As one interview participant noted about their interaction with the SCC,

I am aware of the Prevent strategy down in England and from the inputs we've had from the senior management who are in Prevent the crime campus we have been told that, you know, it's a much different approach [in Scotland]. It's a more proactive [approach], trying to assist the vulnerable as

[8] It is important to recognise that whilst nine respondents disagreed with the statement that the quality of partnership working had improved following the implementation of the crime campus, this does not necessarily mean that the situation has regressed; simply that it has not improved.

opposed to, you know. I mean the intelligence element is there but I have just kind of been reassured and told that it's a different kind of working parameter if that makes sense. (Interviewee E5)

Developing such positive, reciprocal relationships is important given the ways in which the increasingly everyday 'high policing tactics' are experienced by the public, and particularly minority groups, as threatening, humiliating, intrusive, and insensitive (see Jonathan-Zamir et al. 2016, p. 613–614). An additional example of co-operative relationships between the SCC-based agencies and its external partners pertains to how the crime campus interacts with academic institutions. The development of practitioner–researcher partnerships has, of course, been an important aspect of partnership working in a variety of jurisdictions. Reflecting on the promise and challenges of this approach in the United States, Rudes et al. remarked,

Bridging the gap between academics and criminal justice practitioners requires solid partnerships built on access, agreement, goal setting, feedback, and relationship maintenance. When these components merge, both groups benefit from a resilient partnership with the potential for dramatically improving outcomes. (2014, p. 249)

Rudes et al. (2014, p. 260) continue that enduring partnerships here must be mutually beneficial: agencies should not feel that researchers are using them to conduct research with no benefit to the agency. Whilst this is true, it is also worth noting that truly collaborative arrangements between criminal justice agencies and researchers largely remain 'infrequent' (Bales et al. 2014, p. 294). Whilst the findings of this study indicated that the contact between the SCC-based agencies and researchers can be instrumental and infrequent – undertaken, for example, to allow researchers to gain access to particular forms of data – there was also evidence of more enhanced forms of co-operation. In fact, the membership of academics on a committee consisting of representatives from the five core SCC agencies – and responsible for ensuring the full benefits of the crime campus are maximised – represented a step towards a more collaborative relationship.

Deeper collaborative relationships were apparent between the core SCC agencies and those liminal agencies with a partial footprint at the crime campus. This is most clearly evidenced in the development and production of the Scottish Multi-Agency Strategic Threat Assessment (SMASTA). In its initial iteration the SMASTA drew upon police intelligence, analysis, and information from the first year of multi-agency tasking between the five core agencies co-located at the crime campus to create a comprehensive picture of the level of threat, risk and harm posed by organised crime and terrorism in Scotland (Police Scotland, 2015, p. 32). Although signalling a step-change in information exchange between the core agencies, at this stage the participation of outside' partners was negligible, thus limiting the 'multi-agency' aspect of this collective endeavour. Recognising the requirement to both deepen existing arrangements and extend collaboration to other partners, the 2016 iteration of the SMASTA engaged fully with the array of agencies across the both the core and liminal spaces of this new network for high policing. Beyond the production of the SMASTA itself, the principal benefit here has been in the way in which this threat assessment has laid the strategic foundation for the further routinisation of collaboration through multi-agency tasking and the opportunity for appropriate partners to lead on key thematic areas. As the SMASTA matures it may begin to broaden collaboration still further by incorporating inputs from external partners – for example, third sector organisations, community groups, or academic researchers – in order to provide a more comprehensive articulation of the threats Scotland faces from organised crime and terrorism. Extending this collaborative partnership further, however, will require bringing external partners into the ambit of the crime campus, with its particular ethos and practices. There are practical challenges here, particularly in relation to vetting and security issues that would allow participants to engage fully in this process. Any such development of this process, however, would also require understanding – and addressing – some of the challenges, and unintended consequences, of the SCC concept in practice.

Deepening collaboration, but avoiding isolation

The preceding analysis has demonstrated that the SCC has delivered important benefits across this new network of high policing by enhancing co-operation and collaboration with various partners and delivering upon the ethos and promise of the crime campus. The implementation of the SCC has not, however, been entirely without challenge or complication. Evidence was collected during this study that indicated there was still work to be done to fully realise the potential of the crime campus concept in practice. This was particularly apparent in embedding opportunities for deeper collaboration more routinely into everyday business. An interview participant from a partner agency, who is a regular attendee at Gartcosh, recognised the benefits of interacting more frequently with agencies at the crime campus, but also reflected upon the limitations of current practice,

So if everybody is at their desk … if everybody's there it is a real good opportunity for them to talk to one another. My experience is that when we are down there [at Gartcosh] we do most of the asking and we get more of the benefit out of the shared system … That is my point about collaboration: how can we use the information we have to support […] a joint product or products they are working on for their own business, but which we might have information on of value to them? (Interviewee L2)

Another significant issue reported by partners was the perception that the creation of the crime campus has resulted in a certain degree of insularity amongst the SCC-based agencies, with a concomitant perception amongst some partners that the core agencies at the crime campus have become more distant and 'isolated' than under previous arrangements. This was particularly evident in the qualitative interview stage, which disclosed – underneath a broad understanding of the benefits of the SCC – a more critical body of opinion that recognised how the development of the crime campus has introduced a new point of gravity in the Scottish policing and criminal justice landscape. As one interviewee provided when asked about partnership working and the SCC,

There is definitely a benefit [from co-location], but it shouldn't replace the broader partnership working that you then have to engage in. So for example how do [mentions core agency at Gartcosh] liaise outwards into partner's environments as opposed to bringing everything in. There is always a danger that you become almost lazy in your partnership working by assuming that [co-location at the crime campus] is you building partnership. But that's not to say that it isn't a good idea, because I think it is, but … there is a little bit about that their outreach is as well invested in as their internal function … you also […] have to have very good outreach into the worlds that you impact. (Interviewee E2)

Such perceptions are not without precedent or foundation in previous research. In his book-length study Partnership Working Anthony Douglas understands the essence of the partnership approach as 'working together', which in turn means not working in isolation from other professionals and those people who engage with a particular service (2009, p. 3). Further evidence of a tendency to consider the SCC in this way emerged in the perception that an array of meetings and other routine business activities involving partners disproportionately took place at the crime campus, rather than alternative locations such as the offices of partners themselves.

The perception that the SCC has created a new, somewhat isolating presence is likely to have been compounded by the location of the crime campus and some aspects of its design. The SCC has undoubtedly been successful in bringing the core agencies together under one roof and deepening their internal partnership working. This has been achieved through key architectural philosophies and design principles that have emphasised open-plan workspaces, a central shared atrium, and common social facilities; all of which have facilitated the types of informal relationship building that takes place in places like the water-cooler and the canteen. Nevertheless, the physical location of the crime

campus and its tight security measures and practices have, to an extent, precluded non-routine opportunities for outside partners to easily 'drop-in' for face-to-face meetings. The crime campus may be 'strategically' located at Gartcosh in terms of its secure location in the derelict lands of a former steelworks in-between three of Scotland's major cities (Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Stirling), but this has also meant that few, if any, partners are located nearby. In fact, the crime campus was colloquially referred to during research as resembling a 'prison' or a 'castle' due to its imposing, foreboding presence in an exposed, and otherwise quite barren, landscape. Such issues of isolation were compounded by the thorough security procedures at the crime campus. Research participants recognised the requirement for rigorous security at the SCC, given the nature of the high policing activities that take place there. However, partners also reported how the security routines for entry to the SCC were disconcerting for those who were unfamiliar with such procedures. For one research participant,

I think everyone who goes there is somewhat gobsmacked by the level of security. And the fact [relatively routine visitors] like me, are still treated as if we were newly arrived from some other planet. (Interviewee E1)

Such sensitivities and concerns do not represent critical flaws in the philosophy and implementation of the crime campus. The research disclosed, for example, that where partners had participated in familiarisation visits to the campus – and had thus been attuned to its ethos, values, and routine practices – this was effective in countering the feeling that the SCC was isolated from the communities and partners with whom it needs to effectively engage. Yet in the quantitative survey over two-thirds of respondents indicated that they had not been invited to Gartcosh for an orientation visit. By modestly adapting its posture to the outside world – in the words of a research participant 'making itself a little more friendly' – and taking steps to improve its outreach to partners by seeking to reverse any functional pull towards the campus, there are likely to be clear and cost-effective ways to further enhance partnership working with the range of agencies, organisations, and actors beyond the crime campus and upon whom the effectiveness of high policing in Scotland depends. Such challenges may be best considered as creases to be ironed out across time; to be overcome through processes of critical reflection. Addressing these issues will be important as the SCC seeks moves to deepen partnership working and extend collaboration across this new network for high policing.

Conclusion

The SCC is interesting in its philosophical entrenchment of partnership working in the context of high policing. This research has demonstrated how the crime campus exists as a central node within a broader 'new network' for tackling terrorism and organised crime in Scotland; having disrupted physical proximity boundaries, but also seeking to re-negotiate distance in this newly reconfigured field. This network incorporates multiple players: the core 'high policing' agencies based at the SCC; those agencies and actors responsible for other forms of policing, law enforcement and regulation; and those who are involved in ostensibly non-policing activities but with whom partnership working may be beneficial. The research findings demonstrate how communication and co-location underpin various forms of partnership working across this network: from co-operation between the core agencies and external partners, to deeper forms of collaboration between core and liminal agencies. It also highlights the challenges that must be addressed to deepen partnership working and extend collaboration across this new network. The mixed methods approach deployed in this study yielded an interesting array of data for subsequent analysis. A particular strength here is evidenced in the reflective comment gathered in the qualitative research phase, which allowed for the clarification of, and elaboration upon, some of the key issues highlighted in survey responses. Nevertheless, as is somewhat inevitable with small-scale studies conducted in a single jurisdiction, any generalisation of the findings beyond the specific case in question would be unwise. Indeed, care must also be taken to recognise that during research the SCC was, and still remains, in its infancy, and the political landscape

of this post-reform 'new ecology' of Scottish policing within which the crime campus is situated continues to be heavily politicised (see Murray and Harkin, 2017, Fyfe, 2018). The methodology used in this study thus captures a particular snapshot of the attitudes towards, achievements of, and challenges facing, the SCC in its engagement with its partners beyond the crime campus.

Assessing the invigoration of partnership working across this network also makes it possible to critically reflect upon the concept of high policing itself. As early as 1995 Anderson et al acknowledged that the distinction between high policing and low policing was becoming blurred, as police forces increasingly took on a wider range of complex functions (Anderson et al. 1995). O'Reilly and Ellison noted the need to re-conceptualise high policing, arguing that it must be decoupled in theoretical terms from a sole association with state and public policing actors, and instead incorporate the involvement of private security actors in the preserving and augmenting existing power relations (p. 656). Conor O'Reilly further examined the new private categories of high policing, arguing that activities of a range of 'private' actors must now be incorporated alongside those of state security agencies, although the latter remain preponderant. The research reported in this article sheds further light on high policing, and how it is transforming from its conceptual base and manifesting itself over time. Practitioners at the SCC would certainly disagree that a crude or arbitrary distinction between high and low policing accurately and holistically represents the work that they do in tackling terrorism and organised crime.[9] Yet the concept of high policing does capture a large part of the work that is undertaken at the crime campus, and thus it cannot be disregarded.

Conceptually, it may be more useful to consider high policing as a sub-field – a field within a field (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 14) – nested within a wider relational field of policing, which is itself related to broader fields of security, governance, and politics. What this means in practice is that tackling terrorism and organised crime in Scotland depends not only upon the success of the core 'high policing' agencies at the crime campus, but also upon how effectively these SCC-based agencies work together, collaboratively, with partners across the new network, which extends well beyond the perimeter of the crime campus itself.[10] The development of this new network raises previously unconsidered issues of governance, scrutiny, and accountability in such extended partnership working arrangements. A call to further focus on such matters is warranted on two fronts. Firstly, analytically, Giacomantonio astutely assesses (2015, p. 154) that police governance increasingly brings forth a broader milieu of actors engaged in policing, with concomitant concerns in regard to coordination and control across organisational boundaries. Secondly, empirically, the recent challenges encountered in effectively ensuring accountability and oversight of police activity in Scotland (Malik, 2017) raise questions of the efficacy of the current structures and agencies to properly scrutinise the complex emerging practices highlighted in this paper. Exploring such matters will undoubtedly be a fruitful seam for future research.

[9] A view that would be contrary to Brodeur's view (2007) that the distinction between high and low policing is increasingly relevant in the post-9/11 period.

[10] This conclusion resonates with the work of Lambert and Parsons (2017). Drawing upon both academic research in London and professional experience Lambert and Parsons recognise the competing demands between high and low policing, and the requirement to reconcile any tensions between such approaches in furtherance of community-based counter-terrorism policing.

References

Anderson, M., et al., 1995. Policing the European Union. Oxford: Clarendon.

Bales, W.D., et al., 2014. Researcher-practitioner partnerships: a case of the development of a long-term collaborative project between a university and a criminal justice agency. Criminal justice studies, 27 (3), 294–307. doi: 10.1080/1478601X.2014.947807[Taylor & Francis Online],

Balloch, S. and Taylor, M., 2001. Introduction. In: S. Balloch and M. Taylor, eds. Partnership working: policy and practice. Bristol: The Policy Press, 1–14.

Bayley, D.H. and Weisburd, D., 2011. Cops and spooks: the role of the police in counterterrorism. In: D. Weisburd, T. Feucht, I. Hakimi, L. Mock, and S. Perry, eds. To protect and to serve: policing in an age of terrorism. New York: Springer, 81–100.

BBC News. 2004. Agencies get organised over crime, 17 October. Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/3749714.stm [Accessed 18 April 2018].

BBC News. 2016. Campus 'strengthens' fight against international crime, 8 February. Available from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-35503530 [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Berry, G., et al., 2011. The effectiveness of partnership working in a crime and disorder context: a rapid evidence assessment. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/116549/horr52-report.pdf [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Bourdieu, P., 2000. Pascalian meditations. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Briggs, R., 2010. Community engagement for counterterrorism: lessons from the United Kingdom. International affairs, 86 (4), 971–981. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2010.00923.x[Web of Science ®],

Brodeur, J.P., 1983. High policing and low policing: remarks about the policing of political activities. Social problems, 30 (5), 507–520. doi: 10.2307/800268[Web of Science ®],

Brodeur, J.P., 2007. High and low policing in post-9/11 times. Policing, 1 (1), 25–37. doi: 10.1093/police/pam002

Bull, M., 2010. Working with others to build cooperation, confidence, and trust. Policing, 4 (3), 282–290. doi: 10.1093/police/paq018

Carley, M., 2006. Partnership and statutory local governance in a devolved Scotland. International journal of public sector management, 19 (3), 250–260. doi: 10.1108/09513550610658213

Cavanagh, B., Hamilton-Smith, N., and Mackenzie, S., 2015. Organised crime in Scotland and the criminal justice response. In: H. Croall, G. Mooney, and M. Munro, eds. Crime, justice and society in Scotland. London: Routledge, 115–130.

Cheng, F., et al., 2014. Science parks and the co-location of high-tech small- and medium-sized firms in China's Shenzhen. Urban studies, 51 (5), 1073–1089. doi: 10.1177/0042098013493020[Web of Science ®],

Crawford, A. and Cunningham, M., 2015. Working in partnership: the challenges of working across organisational boundaries, cultures and practices. In: J. Fleming, ed. Police leadership: rising to the top. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71–94.

Diamond, J., 2006. Au revoir to partnerships: what's next? International journal of public sector management, 19 (3), 278–286. doi: 10.1108/09513550610658231

Douglas, A., 2009. Partnership working. Abingdon: Routledge.

Elliot, G. and Tatnell, A., 2016. From co-location to collaboration? Organisational cultures and the Scottish crime campus. In: Scottish institute for policing research annual report 2015. Dundee: Scottish Institute for Policing Research, 32–33.

Felzensztein, C., Gimmon, E., and Carter, S., 2010. Geographical co-location, social networks and inter-firm marketing co-operation: the case of the salmon industry. Long range planning, 43 (5/6), 675–690. doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2010.02.006[Web of Science ®],

Fenwick, J., Miller, K.J., and McTavish, D., 2012. Co-governance or meta-bureaucracy? Perspectives of local governance 'partnership' in England and Scotland. Policy & politics, 40 (3), 405–422. doi: 10.1332/147084411X581907

Frost, N., 2005. Professionalism, partnership and joined-up thinking. Sheffield: Children and Families Research Group.

Fyfe, N., 2015a. Innovation in tackling organised crime: co-location, organisational culture and the Scottish crime campus. Oslo: Norwegian Police University College.

Fyfe, N.R., 2015b. Policing Scotland post reform: towards a new shifting 'culture of control' and a new politics of policing? In: H. Croall, G. Mooney, and M. Munro, eds. Crime, justice and society in Scotland. London: Routledge, 167–181.

Fyfe, N.R., 2018. The changing ecology and equity of policing: some implications of reconfiguring boundaries in an era of police reform. In: N.R. Fyfe, H.O.I. Gundhus, and K.V. Rønn, eds. Moral issues in intelligence-led policing. Abingdon: Routledge, 246–261.

GCHQ. 2015. GCHQ and NCA join forces to ensure no hiding place online for criminals, 6 November. Available from: https://www.gchq.gov.uk/press-release/gchq-and-nca-join-forces-ensure-no-hiding-place-online-criminals [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Giacomantonio, C., 2015. Policing integration: The sociology of police coordination work. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gill, P. and Phythian, M., 2006. Intelligence in an insecure world. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gregory, F., 2007. An assessment of the contribution of intelligence-led counter terrorism to the UK homeland security post-9/11 within the 'contest' strategy. In: P. Wilkinson, ed. Homeland security in the UK. Abingdon: Routledge, 181–202.

Harfield, C., 2008. The organization of 'organized crime policing' and its international context. Criminology and criminal justice, 8 (4), 483–507. doi: 10.1177/1748895808096472

Hipple, N.K., 2017. Policing and homelessness: using partnerships to address a cross system issue. Policing: A journal of policy and practice, 11 (1), 14–28.

HMICS, 2007. Common knowledge: a report on a thematic inspection of information and intelligence sharing. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive. Available from: http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/169855/0047328.pdf [Accessed 18 April 2018].
Hudson, B., 2002. Interprofessionality in health and social care: the Achilles' heel of partnership? Journal of interprofessional care, 16 (1), 7–17. doi: 10.1080/13561820220104122

Intelligence and Security Committee, 2013. Intelligence and Security Committee Annual Report 2012–2013. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/intelligence-and-security-committee-annual-report-2012-2013 [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Jonathan-Zamir, T., Hasisi, B., and Margalioth, Y., 2016. Is it the what or the how? The roles of high-policing tactics and procedural justice in predicting perceptions of hostile treatment: the case of security checks at Ben-Gurion Airport, Israel. Law & society review, 50 (3), 608–636. doi: 10.1111/lasr.12216

Kirby, S. and Nailer, L., 2013. Reducing the offending of a UK organized crime group using an opportunity-reducing framework – a three year case study. Trends in organized crime, 16 (4), 397–412. doi: 10.1007/s12117-013-9195-3

Kirby, S. and Snow, N., 2016. Praxis and the disruption of organized crime groups. Trends in organized crime, 19 (2), 111–124. doi: 10.1007/s12117-016-9269-0

Lambert, R. and Parsons, T., 2017. Community-based counterterrorism policing: recommendations for practitioners. Studies in conflict & terrorism, 40 (12), 1054–1071. doi: 10.1080/1057610X.2016.1253989

Leech, N.L. and Onwuegbuzie, A.J., 2009. A typology of mixed methods research designs. Quality & quantity, 43 (2), 265–275. doi: 10.1007/s11135-007-9105-3

Lewis, C., 2013. The Safer Sutton Partnership: blueprint for the future? The police journal, 86 (1), 15–28. doi: 10.1350/pojo.2013.86.1.606

Lockett, N., et al., 2009. The influence of co-location in higher education institutions on small firms' perspectives of knowledge transfer. Entrepreneurship & regional development: an international journal, 21 (3), 265–283. doi: 10.1080/08985620802279973

Lowe, D., 2011. The lack of discretion in high policing. Policing & society, 21 (2), 233–247. doi: 10.1080/10439463.2011.556732

Malik, A. 2017. Steering from the centre: the Scottish police authority and police governance in Scotland. SIPR Research Summary Number 28. Dundee: Scottish Institute for Policing Research. Available from: http://www.sipr.ac.uk/downloads/Research_Summaries/Research_Summary_28.pdf [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Manningham-Buller, E., 2007. Partnership and continuous improvement in countering twenty-first century terrorism. Policing, 1 (1), 43–45. doi: 10.1093/police/pam010

McCarthy, D. and O'Neill, M., 2014. The police and partnership working: reflections on recent research. Policing, 8 (3), 243–253. doi: 10.1093/police/pau022

McKelvey, M., Almb, H. and Riccabonic, M., 2003. Does co-location matter for formal knowledge collaboration in the Swedish biotechnology-pharmaceutical sector? Research policy, 32 (3), 483–501. doi: 10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00020-3

Murray, K. and Harkin, D., 2017. Policing in cool and hot climates: legitimacy, power and the rise and fall of mass stop and search in Scotland. The British journal of criminology, 57 (4), 885–905.

National Crime Agency. 2015. The NCA commitment to working in partnership with UK operational partners. Available from: http://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/publications/178-the-nca-commitment-to-working-in-partnership-with-uk-operational-partners [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Noaks, L., 2008. Private and public policing in the UK: a citizen perspective on partnership. Policing & society, 18 (2), 156–168. doi: 10.1080/10439460802008678

Northcott, C., 2007. The role, organization, and methods of MI5. International journal of intelligence and CounterIntelligence, 20 (3), 453–479. doi: 10.1080/08850600701249758

Northmore, S., 2001. Improving partnership working in housing and mental health. In: S. Balloch and M. Taylor, eds. Partnership working: policy and practice. Bristol: The Policy Press, 97–114.

O'Neill, M., 2014. Playing nicely with others: lessons from successes in partnership working. In: J.M. Brown, ed. The future of policing. London: Routledge, 203–216.

O'Reilly, C., 2015. The pluralization of high policing: convergence and divergence at the public–private interface. The British journal of criminology, 55 (4), 688–710. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azu114

O'Reilly, C. and Ellison, G., 2006. 'Eye spy private high'. The British journal of criminology, 46 (4), 641–660. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azi090

Palmer, D. and Whelan, C., 2006. Counter terrorism across the policing continuum. Police practice and research, 7 (5), 449–465.

Police Scotland. 2015. Annual Police Plan 2015/16. Available from: http://www.scotland.police.uk/assets/pdf/138327/150739/police-scotland-annual-police-plan-2015-16?view=Standard [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Police Scotland. 2016. Crime Campus leading the fight against international crime. Available from: http://www.scotland.police.uk/whats-happening/news/2016/february/crime-campus-leading-the-fight-against-international-crime [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Rudes, D.S., et al., 2014. Build to sustain: collaborative partnerships between university researchers and criminal justice practitioners. Criminal justice studies, 27 (3), 249–263. doi: 10.1080/1478601X.2014.947808

Sarre, R. and Prenzler, T., 2018. Ten key developments in modern policing: an Australian perspective. Police practice and research, 19 (1), 3–16. doi: 10.1080/15614263.2016.1242424

Scottish Executive, 2004. Supporting safer, stronger communities: Scotland's criminal justice plan. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive. Available from: http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/30859/0031627.pdf [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Scottish Police Authority, 2014. Post implementation benefits review. Available from: http://www.spa.police.uk/assets/126884/441011/441132/225921/item12 [Accessed 18 April 2018].

Sennet, J., 2001. Clusters, co-location and external sources of knowledge: the case of small instrumentation and control firms in the London region. Planning practice & research, 16 (1), 21–37. doi: 10.1080/02697450120049542

Sheptycki, J., 2007a. High policing in the security control society. Policing, 1 (1), 70–79. doi: 10.1093/police/pam005

Sheptycki, J., 2007b. Police ethnography in the house of serious and organized crime. In: A. Henry and D.J. Smith, eds. Transformations of policing. Aldershot: Ashgate, 51–78.

Song, M., et al., 2007. The effect of IT and co-location on knowledge dissemination. Journal of product innovation management, 24 (1), 52–68. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5885.2006.00232.x

Thomas, G., 2016. A case for local neighbourhood policing and community intelligence in counter terrorism. The police journal: theory, practice and principles, 89 (1), 31–54. doi: 10.1177/0032258X16630489

Tilley, N., 2016. Intelligence-led policing and the disruption of organized crime: motifs, methods and morals. In: T. Delpeuch and J.E. Ross, eds. Comparing the democratic governance of police intelligence: new models of participation and expertise in the United States and Europe. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 153–179.

Additional information

Funding

This work was supported by funding from the Scottish Police Authority and the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research.